

### And Reflects Credit on the Artists

## REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

The Finding is that Beecher Never  
Did Anything Wrong.

## A CLEAN CARD.

**RENDERING OF THE REPORT—THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ALLEGE THAT IT IS ALL A VILE CONSPIRACY—AND WISH BEECHER HAD SENT FOR A POLICEMAN AT FIRST—THE TRACK OF THE WILY SHEARMAN IS PLAIN.**

NEW YORK, Aug. 28.—The following is the report of the Plymouth Church investigating committee read at the church meeting to-night: To the Examining Committee of Plymouth Church:

DEAR BRETHREN: The pastor of Plymouth Church, the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, addressed to us a letter on June 27, 1874, of which the following is a copy:

BROOKLYN, June 27, 1874.

**GENTLEMEN:** In the present state of public feeling I owe it to my friends and to the church and society over which I am the pastor to have some explanation of the charges made by the insinuations or charges made respecting my conduct as compromised by late publications made in the *Register* and in the *Commonwealth*. The church and the society should be represented, and I take the liberty of asking the following questions:—What is the truth and how can I do that which truth and justice require? I beg that each of the gentlemen named will consider this as if it had been privately and personally sent him, and answer. From the church, Henry W. Sage, Augustus Storr, Henry M. Cleveland; from the society, Henry W. Sage, Augustus Storr, Henry M. Cleveland. I desire you, when you have satisfied yourselves by an impartial and thorough examination or by a committee of disinterested persons, to inform the examining committee or to the church such action as then may seem to you right and

The committee named having signified their willingness to serve in the grave matters so referred to them, Mr. Beecher sent the following letter to the examining committee of Plymouth Church:

JULY 6, 1874.

DEAR BROTHER: I enclose to a letter in which I have requested three gentlemen from the church and three from the society of Plymouth Church, gentlemen of unimpeachable name and who have not been involved in any of the recent controversies, to have, during the year, to make a thorough and impartial examination of all the charges or insinuations which are made against me, and to say to you, and I now respectfully request that you will give to this committee the authority to call upon you and the church, and to me, at any time, and to make such inquiries as they think proper, and to report to me without your foregoing knowledge, and that you should give to it authority to act in your own name, and as thoroughly, in investigation of the facts should be concerned.

HENRY WARD BEECHER.

Thereupon the examining committee duly authorized the committee to call on the pastor of June 27, to act in their behalf also. Second—Your committee can not here refrain from recording our regret and sympathy for the fact that they in common with all the members of the church, under the most unfortunate circumstances have made it necessary to discuss in the most public manner the private life of a member of this church in the present inquiry. But accepting the situation as we found it when we entered upon the high and arduous duty which we have been so profoundly impressed from the first to perform, we deem the grave importance of the work before us. For considerable time vague and indefinite rumors have been circulating in the most casual manner the Christian integrity of our beloved pastor. But nothing had appeared from a reliable source to justify such a language from our committee. We have now received from a letter of Theodore Tilton, dated June 27, 1874, which was published on the 5th day of January, 1874. It was the appearance of this letter that we have been enabled to ascertain, after waiting for some time, afterward, to request an "immediate investigation." It will be seen by the terms of that letter that the proper investigation is asked for by him of the

made respecting his conduct, as compromised by the late publications made by Tilton. We are invited to make an impartial and thorough examination of all the sources of evidence and advise such action as might seem right. The committee have endeavored to make it thorough and impartial and to obtain such facts as are relevant to the inquiry from all attainable sources. The following are the persons who were summoned or requested the attendance of the following persons: Mrs. B. Tilton, Mr. H. W. Beecher, Samuel Wilkeson, J. B. Howard, Theodore Tilton, Samuel E. Beecher, Mrs. N. Morse, O. L. Johnson, Isaac H. Bailey, Mrs. Putnam, John W. Mason, the Rev. W. W. Fenton, Mary Gates, E. F. Norton, Thomas M. Vaille, M. Holmes, the Hon. N. B. Morse, Mrs. Mary B. Bradshaw, Joseph H. May, Mrs. J. B. Tilton, Dr. A. H. Albert, Silas M. D., Charles Covay, M. D. Dr. Menton, Miss Oakley, Miss Elizabeth A. Ovington, Mrs. W. H. Tilton, Mrs. J. B. Tilton, Dr. A. H. Albert, Dr. F. Tracy, Francis D. Moulton, Franklin Woodruff, J. W. Harrison and the Rev. H. W. Beecher. The following persons have attended, as requested, before the committee. One notable exception is Francis B. Tilton, who has refused to appear and testify freely, but has failed to do so. He has submitted three short statements in writing to the committee, each containing one of the reasons why he declined to testify, and of promises to testify. He has called him three times, with the result stated. In addition to the evidence of the persons named, we have examined all other documentary evidence, which in some way was supposed to relate to the subject matter of the investigation. The following is a list of the sources of our investigation. Sessions. Fourth. Mr. Tilton in his letter to Bacon, published on March 10, 1870, stated to him in 1870 that Beecher had committed an offense against him which he forebore to name, and which he alleged to be extracts from a letter, signed by Mr. Beecher, dated January 1, 1861. This is the only statement made by Tilton. Tilton's subsequent statement before the committee, has come to be known as the letter of apology. It is a statement in which Tilton says that there was no allegation before them except such vague allusions to an offense of some sort, which he has never been able to identify. Tilton, and for which, according to the same authority, he had apologized. It will thus be seen that the only statement made by Tilton, what, if any offense had Mr. Beecher committed against Mr. Tilton. Fourth. At Tilton was called before the committee and made an extended written statement, and in a letter to the committee, dated March 10, 1870, an offense referred to in the Bacon letter, so called, was, as Mr. T. now alleges, entirely without foundation. The field of inquiry was somewhat enlarged, and by alleged facts, letters and circumstances, which were alleged to have been committed during that the offense as alleged by Mr. Tilton to state some four years, and until recently,

**AN IMPROPER SUGGESTION**  
or solicitation by Mr. Beecher to Mrs. Tilton. But as time passed and phrases matured their charge passed and matured into another form and substance. The offense committed by Mr. Beecher, as now alleged by Mr. Tilton, is, state subs antially in the third and fourth subdivisions of his statement. By the statement the charge in effect is that Mr. Beecher at his resi-

which is doubly deplored. Mr. Beecher's distress at the situation was boundless. He saw the peril of being even falsely accused! He blameth himself for much that had occurred. He could not tell how much of the impending trouble would be attributed to him, Tilton, and his action for him, which it was his duty to have repressed. "My earnest desire," he says, "to avoid public accusation and the evils which much necessarily follow from it, which have resulted from it has been one of the leading motives that must explain my exertion during these four years in this matter. While in

**IN A MORIBUND CONDITION**  
of mind produced by the distressing difficulties, Moulton again called on him. His manner was kind and conciliatory. He professed, however, to believe that Mr. Beecher had been deceived by the man who would not be taken back again, and by his advice had come near destroying Titton's family. Mr. Beecher expressed many and strong regrets at the misfortune, and said that he had written up some of these expressions and wrote them down, saying that if Titton could send him the paper, he would be glad of procuring a reconciliation. This paper, which is dated January 1, 1871, was entrusted by Mr. Beecher to Moulton's keeping without reading it. It was a long paper, and contained sometimes called the apology and sometimes the con-

Mr. Beecher's production nor is it a correct report of what he said. No man will believe that Mr. Beecher said, "If humble myself as the servant of all, I shall be able to save some." Another sentence, "He forgives me, I have," Mr. Beecher states was not said, and the words "I have" were Pauline. Here, a very important question arises in connection. To what does this apology refer? It declares Mrs. Tilton guiltless, and yet Tilton is not guilty. How can this be? Without now considering the weight of credit to which the respective parties are entitled, where there is a conflict between them, we believe, we are disposed to credit Mrs. Tilton with evidence, that the original charge was improper advances, and that as time passed, she was led to believe that her husband had enlarged into adultery. The importance of this is apparent, because if the charge has been so changed then both Tilton and Moulton are exonerated, and the case necessarily ends their influence in this controversy. What is the proof that the charge in the first place was improper advances, and not enlarged into adultery? The answer is, and that the memorandum in the hands of Tilton, in his wife's handwriting, was to such an effect. And this is denied by both Mr. Beecher and Mrs. Tilton, and the latter has produced it. It is said, further, that Mr. Beecher confessed the fact of adultery. But this is again denied, and he has produced a memorandum inconsistent with the retraction that he received that evening from Mrs. Tilton. If he had confessed what service could the retraction render? If he had not, why should he have retracted? He had that evening confessed adultery to Tilton and Moulton, or to either? What, then, was the change preferred on the evening of December 30? The answer is, that it was made by Mrs. Tilton, which, of course, Mr. Beecher denied. What o-

occurred in the matter of retraction that evening, and all the subsequent conversations, acts, and letters of the various persons directly concerned in dealing with the scandal are consistent with this view and no other. The retraction procured referred to

and to nothing else. It is likely if the main offense had been charged, Mr. Beecher would have been satisfied with anything short of a retraction of that. There is a sort of postscript to the retraction in which Mr. Beecher says he has implicitly denied, thus showing, we submit, that this was the charge that was in the mind of both Mr. Tilton and Mr. Beecher, and the offense for which he was indicted. Tilton, in the last four years has many times said, verbally and in writing, that the charge was a lesser offense than the one in the indictment, and that while a complaint made different and inconsistent statements of the offenses, his allegations were destroyed in the statement of the offense as shown to Dr. Storrs by Tilton and Carpenter, which was made in the presence of Mr. Beecher and his wife and her husband, who, she says, dictated the precise words characterizing the offense. The charge in the indictment was that Tilton had seduced, and she says she protested against it as false when she signed it, and afterward said Dr. Storrs and told him so. Dr. Storrs, in the manuscript preferred by Tilton, which he called the "true story." The offense was stated in the indictment as seducing, and that was in the habit of reading to newspaper men, and personal friends as to others, without, it could be shown, any protest or denial on her part. It is anxious he professed to be not to make known this secret. Mr. Beecher testifies that he met Tilton on the ferryboat about two weeks before the publication of the "true story," and they talked the matter over. He says that Tilton was at first mysterious and non-committal, but that he finally told him that the "true story" was exorbitant to Mr. Beecher, and a prolonged conversation followed, which lasted about an hour, during which the word was said and acted by Tilton that he be-

**BEECHER HAD COMMITTED ADULTERY.**

On the contrary, he had been a man of high moral character, of high moral purity, and complained of only an improper solicitation. Ex-Superior of Harmon, who, like Mr. Beecher, is one of our well-known and reputable citizens, testified to substantially the same experience with Tilton. As to the nature of the charge, Mr. Harmon was further informed, and testified, not only that Tilton never committed adultery, but that Tilton described to him his first interview with Mr. Beecher on the subject of the charge, and that Mr. Beecher had at that time charged Mr. Beecher with the offense of improper advances. Mr. Harmon also testified that in their conversations, which were numerous, with Tilton for more than two years, he never learned of any offense of which he complained. The testimony before the committee shows similar statements by Tilton to various other persons, and it is a very important fact that Tilton treated the matter during four years as an offense which could be propounded for atonement and forgiveness, wholly inconsistent with the charge in its present form. Tilton, in his written statement, says that Beecher made his forgiveness of him for six months, and then, after a private complaint to the offending party, renewed and aggravated the matter and demanded that it be forgiven, and this followed by a restoration of the courtesies of friendship. All these, and other facts, which are set forth in the report, show that in no event could the offense have been the crime of adultery. It might have been the crime of seduction, but it is not conceivable that Tilton, in view of his conduct, believed even that. Still, further, that the so-called adultery was for the man and not for the woman. Mark his cross examination clearly proves Mark his words. He says that the father of the woman he seduced was in the room, and there met Mr. Beecher when the following scene occurred: He (Beecher) burst on

to me, and said that he hoped that the communication which he had sent to me by Mr. Moulton was satisfactory to me." He then and there told Mr. Moulton that he had done wrong, but not so much as some others, had done, referring to his wife, who had made statements to Mr. Bowen that ought to be untrue, and that he was sorry that he had done so. He then, concerning the facts which he had insisted. Here is clear light as to what the apology does not refer to. It disposes of the apology. It is not a confession of guilt. It is not an admission that it refers to nothing of the kind. If the wrong done to which Mr. Bowen refers is the same as that which the words in question refer to, it is "he had done wrong, but not so much as some others," and that is all that is said. Those words and the apology, are susceptible of but one construction. They refer, as Mr. Beecher says, to his deep regret for the wrong he had done, and his desire to obtain information, a few days before made to Mr. Bowen, which led him to execute a purpose, and to make a statement, which he had learned from the Brooklyn Union and Independent. It appears also that the next day Mr. Beecher did not say to Mr. Moulton that he was sorry, which Mr. Tilton says he volunteered to write, which referred to Tilton's business troubles with Bowen, and that he was sorry that he had done so. It is still further testing what was in his mind, as well as in Tilton's, as to the character of the wrong which Mr. Moulton referred to. It is not to be adultery, then he is entitled to the credit of

the invention or discovery that this crime could be the subject of an apology, and reconciliation, forgiveness and reconciliation on the part of the offender and the injured husband. That Moulton's statement was true, and that his confession of offense was adultery is shown by the same circumstantial evidence that has been cited in reference to the fact that there was no adultery. By many persons have a statement in writing attesting both Moulton's estimate of the nature of the crime committed June 1, 1874, wrote the letter dated June 1, 1874, to Moulton in which, among other things, he complained of this thimble and asked him to conduct, and declares his purpose to waste no more energy in trying to satisfy Tilton; who, at this time, had been induced to sign a joint tripartite agreement, so called, in his jealousy. Mr. Beecher says: "My mind is clear. I am not going to write for the public satisfaction that my wife will be better than she is today. God will take care of me and mine." These are not the words of a guilty mind. Moulton's reply reflected upon the character of his profound policy, and his patience to object. At first he writes that he knows the truth, and if he spoken, let it be. I know you can stand if the truth was published to-morrow." Apparently he thought it rather best to determine whether he would like to publish Mr. B.'s to publish the whole matter as he was wise, he crossed out these and other lines and commenced anew. In this new effort on the subject of publishing the whole story, he said if the whole case were published to-morrow," Moulton was right. The pity is that Mr. Beecher did not do so, and so be once more free, and end

THE IMAGINATIONS OF TILTON

and the mutual friend S. These two, whatever else they wanted or designed, did not believe their purposes would be then subverted by publicity. Tilton soon became gracious and kindly. But what shall be said of Moulton, who now asserts, for the first time, that adultery was the offense? Is it possible that this man is so low in his moral perceptions as to believe that a man who has been expelled from the good of his moral Church, could stand up before a church and say, "I am innocent of the crime of adultery"? No. Tilton says his wife was possessed of a "strong and healthy constitution," and "she and I, and my son, had not discovered her mistake from reading St. Paul, nor from the Gospels, nor from the Epistles, nor from the character of adultery was a dogma believed in by even known to Mrs. T., except, perhaps, as a notion of the Woodbury school, of which her husband is not yet weary of discussing, and she has been dealing with which she had no sympathy. There is but one fair conclusion to be drawn from this, and that is, that Moulton was deceived. He knew that Mr. Beecher had been falsely accused of impure advances, and that he desired to have his name cleared up, and that he desired to have the simple truth ever published, so he could stand. Knowing this, he said his wife was innocent, and that he was innocent, and is of little consequence. He now openly stands with Tilton, where he has secretly been from the first. He has been deceived, and he has been deceived by the same means. He has been deceived by these facts and circumstances, that the original charge of impure advances is false, though it has been dropped by these accusers as a matter of course, and he has been deceived. As an act, forthwith, we brand this performance as a fraud that ought to end all allusion to the subject. We have now reached the narrative a little further, we find Moulton, who first appeared as Tilton's friend, after procuring that said spouse and quietly he had been the friend of both of them, the mutual friend, Mr. Moulton, as he discloses his character in these proceedings, appears to be a man who is not to be trusted, and who is not to be trusted to any conclusion. One thing is unfortunately clear, that from this time on, he contrived to maintain and to keep up the same course both in his ability and purpose to keep the peace in good faith. This was certainly room for an honest peace-maker. He was not a peace-maker, but a peace-maker, an impure offense, and that the reputable woman, by some means, had been induced to make the same mistake, and that she had been induced to withdraw, and its force was in a sense broken. Still the fact remained that he had been accused. Mr. Beecher, however, in this situation was not a peace-maker, but a peace-maker, and

to be even falsely accused was a calamity; to prevent publicity would save a still greater calamity, he felt, and, in the light of the results, may one not say he was right, and that a public charge of such an offense would, as he expressed it in his letter to Moulton of February 5, make "confession?" For reasons of malice and revenge, the "accused" would be forced to confess, was preparing to make a deadly assault upon him. This Beecher believed it was his supreme duty to do nothing to prevent the disclosure.

Moulton professed to deprecate Tilton's purpose, and declared if Mr. Beecher would write to him he could and would prevent the disclosure, and he began to take some letters and steps, under the direction and advice of the diplomatic and mutual friend, to prevent the disclosure, and to prevent the suppression of the scandal and the restoration, in some measure if practicable, of Tilton to position and employment, in passing judgment upon the propriety of the disclosure, and the results, it is fair to remember that all through these four years Mr. Beecher was performing a duty and assuming some and greater responsibilities upon him than at any other period of his life. Moulton said, leave me to do as I please, and I will do as I please. "Tilton" asserted, I will keep him in control. It was true, in certain moods he is a dangerous man, but he is a man who recovers and is kind and reasonable. As time passed along it was evident that Moulton was much more successful than he was in his unprosperous business affairs. The reference in his statement to loss of peace and business is significant. At times Beecher became very impatient with Moulton's conduct in London. Much has been said, and not without some justice, of the extraordinary words and tenor of the letter of the 10th of February. In these letters it must be remembered, first, that Mr. Beecher, under the excitement of deep feeling, was not in his normal condition of mind. This is and always has been a marked quality of his mind. Second, in this sore trouble he was dealing with Moulton, a man of a very different type, a facile, a malicious,

IN THE light of these facts there is not a letter from Mr. Beecher nor an act of his, however ill judged, through these four years of anxiety and grief that can not be accounted for upon the plain theory that he was fighting to suppress an outrageous scandal which consisted of a false accusation of adultery, and which he was endeavoring to remove, and further, that he was endeavoring to help a man whom he felt he had unduly injured, and whose case was a matter of public representations which he was afterward made to believe, chiefly by Montrose, were not well founded. The statement that he was not in the country, and was completed without reference to the fact that Mr. Beecher had a warm friendship for Mrs. Tilton, and that he was in the habit of visiting Mrs. Tilton, reciprocating this friendship, began, as her domestic troubles came on, to look more and more like a piece of gross mismanagement; and that this feeling on Mrs. T.'s part became, under the circumstances, so strong as to induce her to leave her husband, and that she belongs to every good husband is not unlikely. In the course of events, especially in December, 1857, Beecher received the impression from Tilton's affections from her husband. The possibility that such a fact might be added to the list of circumstances, which would tend to beget, as he expressed it in his letter of February 3, one of the environments of the mind, and thus, in the opinion of the pastor, him the occasion of deep grief and anguish. Mr. Beecher conceived of the possibility that he had been deceived by Tilton's affections, and that, in not repressing at once any undue affection for him on the part of this distressed woman, he had been guilty of a gross mismanagement, not in her household; we can't but express our regret at two errors into which it is apparent, Mr. Beecher had fallen, and which were a appalling disaster which seemed eminent when he was confronted by a professedly injured husband with a claim for compensation, and a powerful opposition from him to her, a disaster which threatened to brand with infamy a name which, through years of public life, had been a name of honor and respect. He had maintained a most honored place in the world's esteem, yet we feel that in an hour of weakness he had been deceived, and that unjustly work the pastor should have sought counsel from christian men of his own brotherhood, and that he had relied on his own strength, whom he knew little and whose character, as the sequel proves, he sadly misjudged. And that he was deceived, and that he was deceived, in view of the profound sorrow in which he was plunged, and the expression which he

gave to his feelings; that he acted in not guarding so closely his relations with the family of Tilton that there could be no possibility for fear in his own mind even of an undue affection in Mrs. T. for him through any heedless friendship or agency of his. Mr. Tilton, in his statement before the committee, speaks of his house as one of unusual harmony—

[illegible]

making. In the condition of this family in comparison with the distressing circumstances referred to, and the position which Mr. Beecher occupies, it seemed to make the occasion one of deep import, not only to Mr. Beecher, but to all those who were present. At the earliest moment, to say nothing of the great interests of his beloved Plymouth Church, and other churches, and of the thousands of souls involved if publicity should be given to a false and scandalous matter that was seeking expression through the press, the generous mind of Theodore Tilton, Will innocent men, and especially clergy, fight as for their lives to suppress an injurious report, and defend their brethren from extortion, falsehood and revenge? These are questions that unhappily history has too often answered in the affirmative. We know that we see what manner of men Mr. Tuttle and Moulton are, to wonder that Mr. Beecher should have been deceived by them is almost impossible. When we look back upon the record made by this sad story we feel like visiting even today the suffering bed and heart of our young pastor the more earnestly because, not the less, because we revere and love him, and know that no man in all our land is more true, more honest, more devoted, more deeply beloved; because, that in him centers so many and so great interests of church and of humanity, that he stands before us as the foremost among men of master minds of elegant culture, whose words make him to us uncertain words few and far between, much and so often the precious interest of the hour, the word God who made him, and who we have the unshaken faith to believe will deliver him from every evil temptation, and preserve him from one easily preferred, and not easily disproved. It is not enough for the accuser to say, "I make you believe," or "I make you disbelieve," or "I can be taken as confessed." All such arguments are ecclesiastical analog, in their wisdom and recollection, in de-erious charges of the

FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES

has to point unmistakably to the guilt of the accused and as are not consistent with any theory of innocence. Lord Stowell, as cited by Greenleaf, one of the best writers known to our jurisprudence, and especially on rates of evidence, says, "In every case almost the fact is inferred from circumstances that lead to it by fair inference as a necessary conclusion, and unless these were the case, unless this were so held, no protection whatever could be given to witnesses, and the law of evidence would lead to such a conclusion." It may be laid down universally, though many of them of a more obvious nature and of more frequent occurrence are to be found in the annotations, that the circumstances must be so indicative that they universally, because they may be infinitely diversified by the situation and the general manner, and by many other incidental circumstances, apparently slight and delicate in themselves, but which together form an important bearing on decisions on the particular case. The only general rule that can be laid down upon this point is that the circumstances must be such as would lead the jury to draw a reasonable and just man to the conclusion. For it is not to lead a rash and intemperate jury to a conclusion, but to approach one equally capable of two intepretations." Greenleaf further illustrates the kind of independence of the jury in the following manner: "The character of the wife may be proved by the birth of a child and the non-access of the husband, he being out of the country, and the husband's character may be proved by habits of adulterous intercourse and by the birth, maintenance and acknowledgement of a child. A married man going away and leaving his wife in the power and suspicion of adultery to be abtuted only by the very best evidence. His going here and receiving money from a prostitute, and the fact of a common prostitute is sufficient proof of the crime. The circumstance of a woman going to a prostitute is sufficient proof of adultery. These are similar proof of adultery." These

relations are pointed out as unsatisfactory. The case is presented as a precedent, and the principle it is essential to observe there is nothing disclosed by the evidence that proves the charge. The case is founded on the fact that the two women were together under any suspicious circumstances, such as in some unusual hour or place, or consulting together in some secret place. There is no proof of clandestine correspondence nor attempts in that direction. Beecher's letters are shown to have been read by his wife. She testified that she has read and answered as many as 1,000 in three months. The letters were opened by her, and were opened by others, and those that were to go to the church were opened, by the officers of the church, by Beecher, before being placed on the desk. No sort of restriction was imposed as to his letters. The usual facts of the case of Beecher are shown, and the charges are utterly wanting in this case. What then does the case, as put by the accuser, rest on? Answer, upon mere words and assertion. It is supposed that the case is a precedent for the detection of adultery. Tilton says he knows the fact from his wife's confession, January 8, 1873; from the fact that she had confessed to him, and to her mother, Mrs. Morse. This is thus answered, first, that Mrs. Tilton says in effect that this confession was made by her, and that she was made by an imperious, malicious husband, and by means that, in a moral sense, were fraudulent; pretenses and artifices, and that she was made to perjure herself, to traduce her husband, and to pervert the truth, to traduce the church out of his business perplexities. She was made to believe there was a confession, and she made a confession. Mrs. Tilton withdrew the charge when Mr. Beecher first confronted her after he had heard the confession. She was made to believe that she was in order. In this connection, together with the further fact that she has ever since denied the truth of the charge when from time to time she has been asked to do so, she explicitly denies that the charge was adultery. We now see her coming before the committee, and she says she is innocent, and that she and

and in the most solemn manner denies absolutely the charge, and proceeds to set forth facts and circumstances which demonstrate that this unhappy woman has for years been the plastic victim of extorted falsehood. Tilton's allegation that she confessed to her mother was pronounced by her mother to be a lie, and before the committee, that the source of the scandal is the alleged words of Mrs. Tilton, which she explains in such manner as deprive her mother's statement of any force, she comes Mr. Beecher, who declares solemnly that whatever words, by whatever means, have been drawn from her, T. by her husband, he is ignorant of, and any and all impropriety toward her, whether real or pretended, is entirely unknown to him. It is not for the committee to defend the course of Mrs. T. Her conduct on any theory of human

responsibility is defensible. Our hope is that it may be made clear, as the testimony afforded much reason to believe it may, that this distressed woman was so beset by her designing husband when in states of mind differing little, if at all, from mental aberration, brought on by illness and domestic sorrow and gloom, as to induce her, at least passively, to make a charge of improper advances to Mr. Beecher. But when her honest attention was pointed out to her, and the great wrong she had done, she quickly took it back in sorrow and penitence as

SHOWS: DECEMBER 30, 1870.

Wearied with importunity and weakened by sickness, I gave a letter implicating my friend Henry Ward Beecher, under assurances that that would remove all difficulties from me and my husband. That letter I now revoke. I was persuaded to it, almost forced, when I was in a weakened state of mind. I reject it and recall all its statements.

E. R. TILTON.

I desire to say explicitly, that Mr. Beecher has never offered any improper solicitations, but has always treated me in a manner becoming a

There is medical testimony before the committee, given by two eminent physicians, Drs. Menton and Corry, to the effect that such cases of emaciation and starvation by a husband of a strong will over domestic troubles are frequent. Dr. Corry, who has treated many emaciated cases, and who has observed diseases and phenomena, says that such conduct on the part of Mrs. Tilton, when substantial evidence is offered, is ever suspicious or hostile. Kind, however, Dr. Menton provides a letter purporting to have been written by Mrs. Tilton to him in which she says that she was in the presence of this Tilton's presence and that it was a physical impossibility for her to tell the truth. In another letter from the same to the same, she says: "I am not in a position to say anything in consequence of the crime of impure conduct alleged against me. In her statements procured from me by the doctor, I am the prisoner, of December 16, 1872, and which was signed by me." Dr. Storrs, Mrs. Tilton shows that she was unable to believe that

was formed against her husband. They were, "a few weeks afterwards, that is after July 20, 1890, that I learned by circumstances, of a conspiracy against him, in which Beecher had a part, to have an interview with Beecher." This refers to the interview of Tilton with Beecher, procured by Moulton on the evening of December 3, 1890, when Tilton was in the "land" and writing of Mrs. T. It will be seen it was under the influence of a stilling element of a "double agent," her husband that the session was moved to appear to act on the basis. We are told that Mrs. T. was "very anxious" for his forgiveness for the suffering she had caused him. We hear much from Tilton of the confidence placed in him by Beecher, and was obliged to receive his statements on this point, at all, without corroboration; but on one occasion, when Tilton was present, we heard, from the testimony of Miss Elizabeth Turner, in what manner Tilton's accusations were made, and that she was present at any time on this day say she had given any confession to him as regard to Mr. Beecher? She said she had and had confessed to him that she had been intimately with Beecher. She, Mrs. T., was present at the interview, she said, "Oh, Theodore, how can you tell that child he was lying? Now she burns out crying. When was that?" Answer—It all occurred on the day of the interview. This was the day when this witness said that a scene of violence occurred. The witness, Elizabeth Turner, was a young girl, interfered to save her, and was knocked down by T. This witness is the same person who said it was not an accusation, and went to a boarding school to get rid of her, because she had heard Tilton make such a charge against her. Tilton had told Mr. Beecher was so anxious to have her leave town and keep away, that he paid some \$2,000 to get her out of town, and that some \$2,000 were paid, but for quite another purpose. Miss Turner and Mrs. Tilton both agree in saying that she was not present at the interview, because she had sided to her friends that Tilton had twice attempted intimate relations with her husband, and that she had left him in the country. He was not losing place and position because of his social views and associations, but because of his immoral intimacies, who, at that time, was twenty years old. The absurdity of supposing that Mr. Beecher was a "double agent" and a person who would leave town, to whom Tilton has been

against him, is transparent. Persons to whom Tilton had talked in some form of the scandal, sometimes in one shape and then in another were too numerous to justify an investment of \$200 on each by any body whose wealth was not beyond question. The fact was noted that just as Miss Turner was leaving for boarding school Tilton procured from her, with the aid of his wife, a letter denying the reports of his improper liberties. Here again was Tilton a masterful liar of evidence. It is a fact that he had been married to a woman, Mrs. Tilton unavailingly. She has suffered unparalleled trials. Motlton quotes her as saying that in his life he was the only man that was physically important for her to tell the truth in her husband's presence. It will be seen that she was not the only woman in that presence and further that it was when she was away from him and from the presence of her husband that she was asked to lie like that of Catherine Gaunt, an undue confession for her pastor. In this letter to her husband she said that she was the only woman who loved him and received, harmed no one not even from, until the heavenly vision dawned upon her, though your opinions are not restful for congenial to his soul, yet my heart is full of sorrow and a sacred dread that I lose to me. Bless God, with me, for Catherine Gaunt, and for all the sure findings of an all-wise God. This letter was written by Tilton, written June 28, 1871, about a year after the pretended confession. In no sense can its contents be taken from the truth of the audacity. Tilton, when before the committee, when reference was first made to this Scholastic, said that he had never seen the letter. The story of Griffith Gaunt was audacity, and accordingly relied upon this letter as incontrovertible evidence. It was the principle of common law that a married woman can not be held to commit adultery with her husband, and this is upon the idea that the husband's presence and influence amount to a law. Whether it is necessary to invoke this rule of law to excuse Mr. Tilton or not, we may see from the fact that he was not a married man without her volition or assenting, something of the reasons which moved the early exponents of the cause of the adulterous woman. The charges referred to. We have now reviewed as briefly as we could the evidence before us. We have not discussed. We have elided the more important of these and discussed the salient points. The evidence relied upon by the committee to sustain the charges. We are asked to believe, finally, that we have accepted, that he makes as his excuse. We may leave that to the jury as well as by common report, without discussing the character of the persons, that Theodore Tilton has in mind. He is a very different man from what he was formerly reported to be. He will hardly deny that both

NEW MARITAL PHILOSOPHY

signs of degeneracy were setting in, which have made him a discreditable man in this community. In the new role his culmination and downfall are well stated in recent words by a able writer, who, in sketching his career, says that "in the process of time he became a confirmed drunkard, a notorious forger of Victoria C. Woodhull and a plagiarist before he wrote a biography of her, which would have surmounted him on any other where for common sense. Such a book is a waste of time which no author has a right to touch. It is the accurate and the true that counts." Ward Beecher, the pastor of Plymouth Church, has been a clergyman with happiness only a few years. He has been here in this church, which, as all the world knows, has so often been the scene of his noblest and most successful of his eloquent ministrations. The man has been living in the clear light of noon day before the eyes of the people for many a year. A life of great christian usefulness, a life of incessant work. None have known him but as a true and love him. Those who have been so long acquainted with him at home and abroad report nothing of his life or conversation.

(Continued on four page.)